



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

No yellow fever or smallpox reported and nothing of interest has occurred among the shipping.

*Daiquiri*.—Acting Asst. Surg. Juan J. de Jongh reports nothing of interest.

Respectfully,  
 H. S. CAMINERO,  
*Acting Assistant Surgeon, U. S. M. H. S., In Temporary Charge.*  
 The SURGEON-GENERAL,  
*U. S. Marine-Hospital Service.*

SANTIAGO DE CUBA, *February 21, 1900.*

SIR: I have the honor to make the following report of the sanitary condition of the fourth district of the island of Cuba for the week ended February 17, 1900:

*Santiago*.—During this week there was a total of 27 deaths, an increase of 3 over the preceding week. The following were the principal causes: Tuberculosis, 3; tetanus infantile, 2; malarial fevers, 4; intestinal diseases, 7; pneumonia, 3; heart disease, 4; other causes, 4; total, 27. Population, 43,000; mortality, 32.65.

*Yellow fever*.—No cases of yellow fever have been reported for the week, 1 case not previously reported in January came to my knowledge from private sources since my return. The case was removed to the country and the house disinfected.

The steamship *Maria Herrera* was disinfected on February 15, prior to departure for Santo Domingo and Porto Rico. Fifty-three pieces of baggage were disinfected.

The same day the U. S. army transport *McPherson* sailed for New York with the remains of 74 soldiers who died principally of yellow fever. Some of the bodies were in a state of active decomposition, others were nothing but dry bones. The interiors of the hermetically sealed caskets were disinfected with carbolic acid and formalin; previous to embarkation the outside cases were thoroughly washed with a solution of bichloride of mercury.

*Manzanillo*.—Dr. R. de Socarras reports 7 deaths from the following causes: Pneumonia, 1; tetanus, 2; malaria, 1; other causes, 3. Total, 7.

*Daiquiri*.—Doctor Juan J. de Jongh reports no death for the period.

Respectfully,  
 HERMAN B. PARKER,  
*Assistant Surgeon, U. S. M. H. S., In Command.*  
 The SURGEON-GENERAL,  
*U. S. Marine-Hospital Service.*

ENGLAND.

*The vaccination controversy at Leicester.*

[ For thirty years Leicester has been the theatre of a crusade against vaccination which has, from time to time, attracted the attention at least of the medical world. The controversy has now reached the acute stage, and at this writing it is safe to presume that British law is about to overcome most obstinate prejudice. The consular agent makes the following interesting résumé of the agitation:

“In 1867 the British Government passed what was known as ‘The Principal Vaccination Act,’ the object being to make vaccination compulsory under penalty. Pursuant to this act, the Leicester board of guardians, a body constituted under parliamentary authority for the relief of the poor, appointed a vaccination officer, whose duties began on July 1, 1868, and prosecutions for noncompliance with the act com-

menced shortly afterwards. In 1869, the first offender was imprisoned in Leicester, and his imprisonment led to the formation of an antivaccination league. In 1871 an epidemic of smallpox spread across the country, affecting Leicester severely as compared with the majority of other towns. The epidemic lasted until the beginning of 1873, and amongst many thousands of cases there were about 360 deaths.

"After this the antivaccination movement grew, and it is stated that by the year 1886 between 6,000 and 7,000 parents had been summoned before the magistrates under the vaccination act. Year by year the election of guardians was influenced by this question, until in 1883 a board was elected, the majority of the members of which pledged themselves against compulsory vaccination, since which time down to the present no prosecutions have been carried out. There have been several outbreaks of smallpox during the past fifteen years, but the epidemic did not on these occasions assume very large dimensions. In 1889, in response to an appeal by Mr. J. A. Picton, member of parliament for Leicester, the government, through Mr. Ritchie, then president of the local government board, granted a royal commission to investigate the subject. The inquiry under the commission continued for seven years, resulting in the issue of voluminous reports with the following conclusions:

"1. That vaccination diminished the liability to be attacked by smallpox.

"2. That vaccination modified the character of the disease and rendered it (*a*) less fatal, and (*b*) of a milder or less severe type.

"Several other conclusions of a similar character were arrived at. In 1898 the government passed an act embodying part of the recommendation of the royal commission, the object being to moderate the severity of the law and to prevent the repetition of penalties. It also prescribed the use of glycerinated calf lymph, or such other lymph as the local government board should provide. The local government board in October, 1899, in carrying out the provisions of the new act ordered the appointment of vaccination officers by the board of guardians throughout the country, which order has brought the local government board into conflict with several boards of guardians, principally owing to the decision that the vaccination officer so appointed is not under the control of the guardians who, it is alleged, are limited to the appointment and payment of such officer. A conference was held a short time ago by the St. Pancras guardians, and the meeting agreed to oppose the order of the local government board. The last Leicester vaccination officer was appointed July 1, 1868, and continued in office until December 31, 1898, since when, so far as Leicester is concerned, the guardians have not appointed an officer.

"The local government board was called upon to obey the order and in consequence of their continued refusal, proceedings have been instituted against them in the queen's bench division of the high court of justice, and judgment given that a peremptory mandamus should be issued calling upon them to appoint a vaccination officer forthwith. The mandamus was duly served at a meeting of the guardians on Tuesday, September 26, 1899, and at a subsequent meeting on October 3, 1899, at which all the guardians but one were present (including 6 ladies). After a lengthy discussion upon the situation, and after the rejection of a proposal to appoint a vaccination officer who would carry out the wishes of the guardians, it was resolved by 28 votes to 19, 'That this board, after due consideration of the peremptory mandamus of the high court of queen's bench, declares the statement of the local government board

contained therein that the nonappointment of a vaccination officer operates to the great prejudice of the health and well being of the inhabitants of the said parish to be untrue, and resolves that this board confirm and continue the policy of previous boards in taking no step which will have the effect of instituting proceedings against parents under the compulsory vaccination act.”

Since the above report was rendered the solicitors to the local government board attended the meeting of the guardians and served each member with a notice requiring him to make a return to the writ of mandamus of the high court within eighty-one days. Mr. Briggs moved that the resolution adopted by the board not to appoint a vaccination officer be indorsed on the mandamus and then returned to the high court. Mr. Kemp, leader of the minority, urged that they would certainly be sent to prison, and he asked whether they had considered the cost. He moved as an amendment the mandamus be indorsed to the effect that the board take steps to fill the vacancy.

It was strongly urged that the board, if they appointed an officer, would be able to insist on his obeying their instructions. The discussion became rather heated, and on a vote the amendment was defeated by 26 votes to 20, 1 guardian declaring that he must vote for the appointment as he could not afford to go to prison. The majority included 5 ladies. The resolution was then put and carried. Following that meeting, the solicitors made another to induce the board to obey the plain mandate of the court, but by a narrow majority the board adhered to the course marked out, and there the matter rests.

It can be presumed that the court is patiently and leniently awaiting pacific developments. \* \* \*

S. C. MCFARLAND.  
*United States Consul.*

*The vaccination controversy at Leicester.*—Continued.

JANUARY 31, 1900.

The following report, supplementary to that contained in my annual report of October 27, 1899, in relation to the antivaccination crusade in Leicester, is furnished by Consular Agent Partridge, at that place. It will be seen that legal proceedings have terminated, and that at last the Leicester guardians have submitted to law, thus practically ending a controversy which has engaged the attention of the medical world.

S. C. MCFARLAND,  
*United States Consul.*

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT.

If reference be made to that part of the original report which deals with the subject of the antivaccination crusade, it will be found that the last proceedings recorded in the dispute between the local government board and the Leicester board of guardians as to the refusal of the latter to appoint a vaccination officer, was a resolution passed by the guardians on October 3, 1899, confirming and continuing the policy of previous boards of guardians in taking no step which would have the effect of instituting proceedings against parents under the compulsory vaccination acts.

Since the passing of that resolution, the following events have occurred :

At a meeting of the guardians held on October 10, 1899, further process issued by the high court of justice was served upon the members